

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 94 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #504
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 25 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 504

Today's Topics:

 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 25 Oct 1994 00:45:12 GMT
From: n7fzy@netcom.com (Dave Whitlock)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <389n39\$5at@ccnet.ccnet.com>, rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
writes:

> This was found floating on the Amateur Packet BBS system. What do you think?

>

>

> From : K7WWA@K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

> To : INFO@ALLUS

>

> *** FLAME ON

> *** I think this needs to be shared.

> *** AB6GQ was licensed on 2 Jul 1991. He is now an Amateur Extra (?). He

> *** sure must think his is something if he really started this one.

> *** FLAME OFF

>

> Original from AB6GQ to SYSOP@NCPA

> Path: !KC6PJW!WX3K!WB0TAX!KA6EYH!KA6EYH!W6PW!KA6FUB!WA6RDH!KM6PX!

>

> From : AB6GQ@KM6PX.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM

> To : SYSOP@NCPA
>
> Hello dedicated SYSOPs. My name is Fred Sober, and I am the Official
> Observer Coordinator for the Sacramento Valley Section of the ARRL. I
> am sending this bulletin at the suggestion of some of the local BBS
> SYSOPs, who thought you should be aware of the following info:
> .
> .
> .
>
> *** Yes, Fred, keep up the good work. I'm glad that you are doing all
>
> *** that you can to make Amateur radio packet boring.
>
> *** 73 George K7WWA @ K7WWA.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM
>

As is often the case, people have a tendency to flame before they get all the facts.

This weekend I attended the Northern California BBS Sysops meeting at Pacificon. This issue and the people involved live in this area and are known to some of the Sysops, so let me try to give everyone a little more direct info.

Fred Sober, as 00, was asked a question by a local ham:

If broadcast bulletins of non-amateur subjects are illegal on voice, why is it OK on packet?

Fred did not know the answer (nether would I), so he started up the ARRL chain of commands asking the Section Manager etc. Each level in turn said that they did not know the answer and referred him up to the next level. Finally he was talking to ARRL HQ.

They also said they did not know and referred him to the FCC and asked him to "let them know what the FCC says." (I don't know who I was at HQ that said this, but it sure does not sound like a good idea to me). So, Fred started corresponding with the FCC. The results he got were right out of Part 97.

Even then, Fred attempted to keep this quite until it could be discussed and perhaps a solution found. He posted a "Private" Sysop only bulletin for Northern California only to make Sysops aware of the situation. A certain Sysop in the area re-addressed the message to a regular bulletin with world wide distribution. Now the hate mail is coming in to Fred.

Now I don't like the results from the FCC. But I do not blame the messenger.

Fred was responding in a proper manor to a legitimate question directly involved with his 00 duties. All of this is documented with copies of the correspondence. Several of the local Sysops have seen it and were aware of this as it happened over the last year.

So next time it would be nice if some people would try to find out the facts before they start slinging mud.

--
Dave Whitlock
N7FZY@N7FZY.#NOCAL.CA.USA
n7fzy@netcom.com

Date: Mon, 24 Oct 1994 22:20:25 GMT
From: ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))

References<37kfob\$P4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> <RFM.940ct17113936@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<384r4i\$ir8@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:

: >Robert, could you come up with some new ideas instead of just new names?
: >In the mid seventies a typical paperback book was \$1.25; now it's \$5.
: >The very same 4:1 ratio.

: Dana, membership in the ARRL (a non-profit organization) and purchasing
: a paperback novel (a profit venture) are two entirely different things.
: But since that idea seems to appeal to you, the Timex watch I now wear
: costs LESS than the exact same model did 15 years ago. A Radio Shack
: TRS-80 computer, with external hard drive and floppy would set you
: back nearly \$10,000 in 1980. Now, you can buy a superior computer
: with more memory, a larger hard drive and a larger floppy drive for
: under \$600. Need I go on?

Well, the cost of wages has tracked inflation pretty well. The cost of printing, and fuel oil to heat the building... well, need I go on?

I have never thought the cost of ARRL membership was excessive. It just couldn't be done for \$7.50 a year, with or without QST. Even the concept of membership WITHOUT QST is not all that simple. The ARRL revenues come from three basic sources -- membership dues, "profits" from book sales and advertising revenues. If we had membership exclusive of QST (we actually do, with blind and family membership available), if the number of QSTs printed dropped, we would have to decrease the ad rates and decrease the size of QST, which would mean we would have to increase dues rates for a

decreasing magazine size... well, you get the idea. As much as I would like to be an idealist and hope that amateurs would support the League solely for the good works we do, it is like public TV; there would be a lot more watchers than pledgers. I am glad that is not my job to figure it all out; I just trust those who do to make the right choices for me and let it go at that. Just like they trust me to make the right technical choices when I manage the Lab.

73, Ed

--

Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org

Date: Mon, 24 Oct 1994 22:27:04 GMT
From: ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))

References<19940ct17.194607.27017@arrl.org> <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<389asu\$f2n@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu>
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu) wrote:

: In article <37va9s\$b6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,

: Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:

: >Case in point: I was recently at a convention, in which I asked one of the
: >League Directors a few questions. His first response to me was an inquiry
: >as to whether I was a League member or not. When I said no, he promptly
: >told me to stop wasting his time.

: Was it Tom Comstock that you claim said this? If so, I'll publicly say
: "<wrong>". Tom, who is your Director, doesn't believe that. He and I have
: had extensive discussions on the subject.

I don't know of any Director who would believe that. Unfortunately, one really never knows who is behind the League booth. I have been to Conventions where most of the time the League booth was staffed mostly by those few local volunteers who were willing to sit there all day, and when I or the Director was away, they did the best job they could with little training. And, although the League is as much the local Field Organization as it is the Directors and Headquarters staff, we really can't always speak authoritatively for each other; I am no expert on the local doings in the Weast Gulf Division, and the Field volunteers don't always know the latest activities in the ARRL Lab.

Fault the organization for not training the local volunteers, but don't paint us all with the same brush; we really are all different cogs in the wheel.

73, Ed

--

Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #504
